

hon. friend from Victoria. I expressed my views pretty plainly the other day when the Bill was before the House. I consider it is in the interest of all parties, especially the Indians, that this Bill should pass in its present form. I have considered the matter since I last spoke, and I have not had any occasion to alter my opinion. All that my hon. friend has stated about Mr. Duncan is strictly correct. He was possibly one of the best missionaries that ever visited the Pacific coast. Some thirty years ago he went in amongst those savages, when they were as wild as the wild animals that roamed in that section of British Columbia, and he civilized them and established a number of very important industries—saw mills, canneries, manufacturing woollen cloths, etc.; but that day has gone by, and a different condition of affairs prevails to-day. Thirty years ago Alaska belonged to Russia, but for over twenty years it has been a part of the great Republic and has made vast strides. A large population has gone in there, and not only are the Indians in the northern portion of British Columbia pretty well civilized now, but the natives of Alaska are also civilized. Another fact to which I would draw the attention of the House is this: Mr. Duncan was not a clergyman. He was sent out by some society in England, and he acted as a missionary very successfully indeed. The mistake that Mr. Duncan made was, that after he civilized these Indians and made them amenable to the laws of the land, he did not retire and place the missionary work under the charge of some recognized denomination. That the present bishop, to whom the hon. gentleman has referred, should be allowed to continue trading with the Indians is, I think, contrary to the work that he is supposed to perform among them. As I mentioned the other day, that gentleman has been the means of creating a great deal of discord and trouble in that portion of our Territories.

HON. MR. MACDONALD (B.C.)—Who has done that?

HON. MR. McINNES (B.C.)—The present bishop—Ridley, I think, is his name. He brought the Indians to the verge of rebellion some years ago—to such an extent, anyway, that the Local Government

had to send up a force there and keep them at the reserve for some length of time. I am not as well acquainted with that portion of the Province as my hon. friend is, but I know that the view that I hold with respect to the southern portion of the Province is strictly correct, and I am much surprised to hear that the Indians in any part of British Columbia cannot be supplied by traders, but must depend upon the missionaries to supply their wants.

HON. MR. MACDONALD (B.C.)—Will the hon. gentleman tell me how it can benefit the Indians not to allow this to be done?

HON. MR. McINNES (B.C.)—If there is a sufficient population of Indians there to warrant the establishment of saw-mills, canning factories and other industries, we have enough commercial enterprise in British Columbia to do a legitimate trading business with them.

HON. MR. MACDONALD (B.C.)—Traders cannot go on the reserves, to begin with.

HON. MR. McINNES (B.C.)—They can settle on the very border of a reserve.

The motion was agreed to, and the Bill was read the third time, and passed.

FRANCHISE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

The Order of the Day being called, "Third reading Bill (136) 'An Act further to amend the Revised Statutes, Chap. 5, respecting the Electoral Franchise.'"

HON. MR. ABBOTT moved that the Bill be not now read the third time, but that it be referred back to a Committee of the Whole House, for the purpose of amending the same.

The motion was agreed to.

(In the Committee.)

HON. MR. ABBOTT said: The first amendment which I intend to propose to the committee is to clause 6. The language of sub-section 4, which is substituted in the Bill for the one which is repealed, is not accurate. The substance is